

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/608,070	06/30/2003	Masahiro Ebiko	OGW-0263	7834
23353 7	590 01/18/2005		EXAMINER	
RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC			FISCHER, JUSTIN R	
LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			1733	

DATE MAILED: 01/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/608,070	EBIKO, MASAHIRO			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Justin R Fischer	1733			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailinearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 J	lune 2003.				
	·				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1,2 and 5-7 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 3,4,8 and 9 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	, ,			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Application trity documents have been receive nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>063003 and 092403</u>. 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	atent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/608,070

Art Unit: 1733

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kajikawa (JP 2001-191745). As best depicted in Figures 1, 2, and 4, Kajikawa is directed to a pneumatic tire construction having an ornamental section 9 over a substantial portion of the sidewall region (represented by arc Dp). The reference further teaches that the ornamental section is formed by groupings of vertical ridges 10, wherein said groupings are circumferential spaced by sidewall regions 11 (analogous to 2a of claimed invention). In this instance, the vertical ridges are analogous to the "concave grooves on the sidewall surface" and thus define "numerous cocavo-convex stripes". As to the depth of the grooves (defined between ridges), Kajikawa suggests a depth between 0.3 to 2.0 millimeters (Paragraph 24). While the vertical ridges of Kajikawa extend away from the sidewall portion, the claim as currently drafted does not require that the ridges or grooves are recessed into the sidewall portion. In regards to the interval between adjacent serrated portions (analogous to distinct groupings of vertical ridges), Kajikawa suggests a spacing d between 1.3 and 5 times the spacing δ between vertical ridges within a grouping (Paragraph 32), wherein the spacing δ is between 0.3 and 5.0 millimeters. Thus, Kajikawa positively teaches, at a minimum, an

Application/Control Number: 10/608,070 Page 3

Art Unit: 1733

embodiment in which d is at least equal to 6.5 millimeters (occurs when δ = 5.0 millimeters). As to the spiral arrangement of the serrated portions, it is clearly evident that the vertical ridges of Kajikawa are inclined with respect to the radial direction of the tire (up to 60 degrees, Paragraph 9)- this arrangement is seen to constitute a spiral arrangement in an analogous manner to the claimed invention.

It is initially noted that the distance between adjacent serrated portions (in the claimed invention) is described as being measured in the radial direction. It is evident that the distance d increasingly becomes a "radial measurement" as the inclination of the groupings (of vertical ridges) increases. Furthermore, when the groupings are not heavily inclined, the <u>radial</u> spacing between groupings is greater than the axial distance d depicted in Figure 4.

With respect to claim 5, Kajikawa teaches that the spacing δ is between 0.3 and 5.0 millimeters. This distance is analogous to the alignment pitch of the claimed invention and such, the range of Kajikawa fully incorporates the range of the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 7, Figure 4 of Kajikawa depicts the grooves (defined between adjacent vertical ridges) as having a trapezoidal shape in cross-section.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

⁽a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 10/608,070

Art Unit: 1733

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kajikawa. As best depicted in Figure 1, the ornamental section of the tire having a plurality of groupings of vertical ridges extends over an arc Dp defined by the points O and I. It is clearly evident said arc occupies a substantial portion of the sidewall (defined as the region between the rim check line and the tread design end). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized such a region as representing greater than 30 percent of the sidewall region. In any event, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to form between 30 and 70 percent of the sidewall with the above noted ornamental section depending on the desired aesthetic characteristics of the tire. It is further noted that while it is unclear if the drawings are "working drawings", they reasonably convey a pneumatic tire construction in which the ornamental section occupies at least 30 percent of the sidewall portion.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kajikawa and further in view of Barrese (US 5,728,242). As depicted in Figure 4, the vertical ridges 10 of Kajikawa define a plurality of grooves having a trapezoidal cross-section. While the reference fails to suggest the formation of grooves with a triangular shape, it is extremely well known that grooves are commonly formed with both trapezoidal and triangular orientations, as shown for example by Barrese (Column 4, Lines 66+). In this instance, Barrese is directed to an extremely similar tire construction and suggests the use of either trapezoidal or triangular ribs (define geometry of recesses or grooves). It

Application/Control Number: 10/608,070 Page 5

Art Unit: 1733

is emphasized that each of these geometries is extensively used in a wide variety of decorative designs in the manufacture of tire sidewalls and as such, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have found it obvious to form the grooves of Kajikawa with a triangular cross-section (represents a well-known and suitable geometry). Lastly, applicant has not provided a conclusive showing of unexpected results to establish a criticality for a triangular cross-section.

Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 3, 4, 8, and 9 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The closest prior art of record is Kajikawa- the reference, though, fails to include a protection protrusion along the periphery of each serrated portion and fails to describe the serrated portions as being triangular in shape and having a narrowing width from a radially outer end of said serrated portion.

Conclusion

- 7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Endo (Des. 475,345) depicts a tire construction having a sidewall decorative arrangement that appears to be spirally oriented.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Justin R Fischer** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-1215**. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30-4:00).

Application/Control Number: 10/608,070 Page 6

Art Unit: 1733

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine Copenheaver can be reached on (571) 272-1156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

, Justin Fischer

January 13, 2005